| TOTAL CYANIDE BY SEMI-AUTOMATED COLORIMETRY EPA 335.4 REVISION 1.0 AUGUST 1993 | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|---|----------|----------|--|
| Facility Name: | VELAP ID | | | | | |
| Assessor Name:Analyst Name: | Inspection Date | | | | | |
| Relevant Aspect of Standards | Method Reference | Υ | N | N/A | Comments | |
| Records Examined: SOP Number/ Revision/ Date | Analyst: | | | | | |
| Sample ID: Date of Sample Prepare | ration: Date of Analysis: | | | nalysis: | | |
| Were samples collected in glass or plastic bottles? | 8.1 | | | | | |
| Were collection bottles previously cleaned and rinsed with reagent water? | 8.1 | | | | | |
| Were samples preserved to a pH ≥ 12 with NaOH and cooled to 4°C at the time of collection? | 8.3 | | | | | |
| Were preserved samples held at 4°C for not longer than 14 days? | 8.4 | | | | | |
| Were LCRs determined initially, every 6 months, and whenever a significant change in instrumentation is made or observed? | 9.2.2 | | | | | |
| Did verifications of linearity consist of at least a blank and three standards measured to be within ±10% of initial calibration values? | 9.2.2 | | | | | |
| Were second-source QCS determined to be within ±10% of stated values? | 9.2.3 | | | | | |
| Were LRBs analyzed with every batch of samples? | 9.3.1 | | | | | |
| Were LFBs analyzed with every batch of samples to be either between 90 and 110% of expected value or within ±3 standard deviations of historical data? | 9.3.3 | | | | | |
| Were mid-range IPCs analyzed following daily calibration, every tenth sample, and at the end of sample runs to be within ±10% of stated values? | 9.3.4 | | | | | |
| Were LFMs analyzed at a rate of 10% of samples to be between 90 and 110% recovery? | 9.4.1 | | | | | |
| Were LFMs fortified to be not less than four times the MDL? | 9.4.1 | | | | | |
| When LFMs fell outside the designated recovery, were the failures determined to be matrix not system related? | 9.4.3 | | | | | |
| Notes/Comments: | | | | | | |

TOTAL CYANIDE BY SEMI-AUTOMATED COLORIMETRY EPA 335.4 REVISION 1.0 AUGUST 1993

| Relevant Aspect of Standards | Method Reference | Υ | N | N/A | Comments |
|--|---------------------|---|---|-----|----------|
| Was distillation apparatus setup so that samples were distilled into 0.25 N NaOH? | 11.1 | | | | |
| When samples contained NO_3 and/or NO_2 , were 0.2 g/ 50 mL sample portions of sulfamic acid added, and samples mixed for three minutes? | 11.3 | | | | |
| Was 5 mL 18N H ₂ SO ₄ and 2 mL MgCl ₂ per 50mL sample added to samples through the air inlet? | 11.4 | | | | |
| Were the solutions heated to boiling and refluxed for 1.5 hours? | 11.5 | | | | |
| Was heat turned off after refluxing and airflow continued for at least 15 minutes to cool samples? | 11.5 | | | | |
| Were all reagents pumped with 0.25N NaOH until stable baselines were obtained? | 11.6 | | | | |
| Were all samples and QC samples in 0.25N NaOH? | 11.7 | | | | |

Notes/Comments: